

# American Opinion Summary

**Department of State** Permanent file copy  
Do not remove

No. 106

October 26, 1962

## RUSSIA AND CUBA

Initial comment indicates agreement that the U.S. cannot accept a moratorium on activities relating to Cuba which would leave the Cuban weapons threat intact (e.g. Balt. Sun, N.Y. Times, Wall St. Journal, Scripps-Howard's Wash. News, Wash. Post). As the Philadelphia Inquirer expresses it, "the missile bases MUST be dismantled before we can talk peacefully with Russia, Cuba or even the U.N."

A few suggest that a moratorium period would be used by the Russians to strengthen their positions by stealth (e.g. N.Y. Herald Tribune, Phila. Inquirer). Past Soviet deception "makes it impossible for this country to accept the Soviet word as a sufficient guaranty that the missile shipments will, in fact, be suspended," the New York Herald Tribune asserts.

Negotiations under reasonable conditions are considered desirable by a number (e.g. N.Y. Herald Tribune, N.Y. Times, Phila. Inquirer, Wash. Post). Interpreting the President's position to be that negotiations will be undertaken as soon as the missile threat is removed, the Washington Post concludes: "This is a wholly reasonable position which leaves the door wide open to a peaceful solution in keeping with the security of the Western Hemisphere."

The New York Times says that "sooner or later, negotiations must get under way, not merely on Cuba but on the whole world crisis." The Boston Herald suggests that we should assist Khrushchev "to find a graceful way to retreat."

However, a few express considerable dubiousness about negotiation now (e.g. Hearst's N.Y. Journal-American, Wall St. Journal). The Wall Street Journal sees "little point in negotiating when one side defines it as trying to take everything we've got."

President Kennedy's policy has united the Western Hemisphere, some stress (Balt. Sun, Wash. Post). "By narrowing the dispute to the question of shipping nuclear missiles to Cuba, this country has 'found a unifying denominator,' and avoided splitting Latin America," the Post says. William H. Chamberlin suggests that the decisiveness of U.S. action brought the OAS support.

The cold war is entering a potentially crucial stage, Roscoe Drummond suggests. "Either the Soviet Union or the United States will have to back away. In either event the consequence will mark a turning-point in the cold war," he says.